

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLEASANT VIEW CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD**

**April 21, 2022**

[PC 4.21.22 - YouTube](#)

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Dan Crandall  
James Cummings  
Julie Far  
Andy Nef  
Dean Stokes  
David Park  
Jeff Bolingbroke  
Dean Stokes  
Manya Stolrow

**STAFF PRESENT**

Jill Hunt, Planner

**VISITORS**

Mr. Jones

**MINUTES PREPARED BY**

Brooke Smith, MMC

**APPROVED:**

Approved August 3, 2023

Commission Chair, Manya Stolrow, called meeting to order at 6pm

**OPENING PRAYER**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTREST**

The chair acknowledged the presence of everyone and expressed greetings. To start the proceedings, the chair turned the time over to Commissioner Stolrow who shared a motivational quote from Winston Churchill, emphasizing the importance of courage and perseverance in the face of success and failure. Followed by the recitation of the pledge of allegiance.

Expressing gratitude, the speaker thanked everyone for their participation.

Moving forward, the chair introduced the first agenda item, which was the Declaration on conflicts of interest. The speaker inquired if anyone had reviewed the meeting agenda and needed to declare any conflicts of interest. They ensured that all attendees had an opportunity to disclose any potential conflicts. Observing no one indicating a conflict of interest, the meeting proceeded to the next agenda item.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEM**

**Discussion/Decision: Preliminary Subdivision Approval of Deer Crest VI A & B, located at approximately 4275 N 1400 W**

During the meeting, the first administrative item on the agenda was the preliminary subdivision approval of Deer Crest VI A & B, which was located approximately at 4275 N 1400 W. The speaker addressed the action item, stating that it would be discussed and decided upon.

The speaker then opened the floor for the staff to provide further discussion on the item. The staff stated that they had reviewed the request and assessed it based on the subdivision code and other requirements. It was noted that the initial plans did not meet the minimum lot area, but the applicant had submitted updated plans. The Planning Commission would consider the design and its relationship to the environment, taking into account specific design standards and improvements to health and welfare.

The staff recommended approval of the request, with the condition that there be improved water efficiency and compliance with all other departmental requirements. The speaker invited questions from the staff at this time, and one question was raised regarding the zoning of the area as an RA 20 zone with a 7500 square footage requirement. After some discussion, it was clarified that the recommendation was for improved water efficiency and street trees.

A member of the commission sought elaboration on the recommended conditions and expressed concern about past experiences with conflicting advice on landscaping choices. They mentioned the challenges of maintaining water-friendly designs without facing issues such as puncture weeds. They questioned the responsibility of the petitioner and what would happen if they failed to comply with the conditions.

Staff responded, explaining that the conditions were being proposed as part of the recommendation to the city council. They emphasized the importance of implementing water-efficient designs in new developments and suggested that the petitioner address the specific questions raised. The petitioner was invited to come forward and state their name and address.

The petitioner, Mr. Jones, acknowledged that they were aware of the recommended condition to improve park strips and water usage. They mentioned having done their homework and being familiar with the requirements. Mr. Jones stated that they had already taken water conservation into account and had made efforts to comply with waterwise practices in their plans.

A discussion ensued regarding the difference between allowing grass in the park strips versus having waterwise landscaping elsewhere on the property. Mr. Jones explained that they had chosen to focus on improving the park strips as they were the most inefficient areas for lawn and often led to overspray. He mentioned the recent state recommendations on water conservation and the need to address the water shortage issue.

The commission expressed their support for the waterwise approach and noted that historical water usage and projections indicated a future scarcity. They highlighted the importance of paying attention to efficient systems for new developments to prevent water depletion. The speaker emphasized the need to consider the long-term water sustainability of the city.

One topic that came up was the idea of a grandfather clause and the need to establish an ordinance for new developments. The participants acknowledged the difficulty of the task and the necessity of drawing a line to determine the point where the change should be implemented.

There was a suggestion to adopt a recommended statement on safe waters for new homeowners. While it was not mandatory, it was proposed that they be provided with a printed copy for their reference and potential incorporation.

The issue of water retention and detention for the current and previous phases of the development was raised. Concerns were expressed about the water retention area and its adequacy. It was explained that a detention basin had been built, holding 155,000 cubic feet of water, which exceeded the requirements set by the aircraft.

Questions were also raised about access to 4300 and the presence of easements. The petitioner clarified that there would be no driveway access to 4300, except where a road connection was planned.

The number of homes and the uncertainty of the market conditions were discussed. The petitioner mentioned the possibility of splitting the project into two phases (VI A and VI B) and recording them separately based on market conditions. The exact number of homes affected by water and park strip arrangements was still under consideration.

The discussion touched on various other points, including mining and blasting regulations, landscape materials disposal, and zero-scaping practices. The commissioners emphasized the need to review existing ordinances and recommendations from staff.

## **MOTION**

Finally, a motion was made to approve the project as presented by staff, with specific concerns related to detention ponds, zero-escaping watering recommendations, staff recommendations, and staff review comments. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

## **LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING 39:32-460:20**

**Discussion/Decision: Consider amending the Pleasant View Municipal Code Chapter 18.18-Agriculture Zone (A-5) Ordinance by removing 'Residential facility for persons with a disability' and 'Residential facility for elderly persons' from the list of uses allowed in that zone.**

The chair introduced the second item on the agenda, which is a public hearing to discuss and make a decision regarding the proposed amendment to the Pleasant View Municipal Code Chapter 18.18-Agriculture Zone (A-5) Ordinance. The proposed amendment aims to remove "Residential facility for persons with a disability" and "Residential facility for elderly persons" from the list of permitted uses in that zone.

The chair mentions that they will briefly discuss the definitions related to this amendment and asks the staff to provide some background information. However, it is decided that the topic will be tabled for the night, and they will move on to the final step after receiving some background information.

The background information includes a discussion about different types of living and nursing homes, specifically focusing on elderly housing facilities. They also discuss the need to improve or eliminate these facilities as a conditional use in the designated area, as mentioned in the general plan that identifies preferred locations for commercial development.

The discussion also involved evaluating residential services, and the planning commission is seeking a recommendation on further consideration of the types of facilities under review. It is clarified that there are no specific proposals at the moment, but there are different definitions provided in the meeting packet. However, more time is needed to research and define the scope of these facilities.

It is recommended that the removal of these facilities from the zone be delayed for now. The reasoning behind this recommendation is that during this interim phase, someone could potentially submit a proposal, and if they proceed with more clarity on the definitions, they might face a delay until the review process is completed.

The commission's decision to table the discussion allows them to review the matter and determine their intentions. One member suggests reviewing the City Council notes from the previous discussion to

understand their concerns and thoughts, which is why the issue has returned to the planning commission. They request that the minutes be sent to the committee for reference.

One member shares their personal experience with family members in various types of care facilities, such as living homes, nursing homes, and skilled nursing homes. They emphasize the importance of these facilities in the area, noting the difference in qualifications and costs associated with each type. They express support for the addition of more facilities in the region but emphasize the need to carefully plan their locations.

Acknowledging the complexity of the matter, the member appreciates the decision to take more time for study. They believe that the city could benefit from allocating a couple of weeks to ensure the facilities are appropriately mapped out.

### **MOTION**

The chair asks for a recommendation to table the discussion for the time being, and a motion is made and seconded. The members express their agreement through an affirmative vote.

### **CHAIR AND STAFF DISCUSSION**

The focus of the discussion was on defining the land overlay zone and its implications for new development. The need to identify sensitive land areas, especially considering the housing shortage and potential church developments, was emphasized. It was mentioned that further consultation with geologists and wildlife specialists would be beneficial in understanding the impact of sensitive soils and rocks. The concern was raised regarding water runoff from areas such as tennis courts and how it could affect the environment.

Clarification on the regulations governing trees and landscaping in parks was requested, with an emphasis on preventing root-related sidewalk damage. The suggestion was made to use products to guide root growth downward and to have an approved list of trees for specific locations. The importance of training and guidelines for tree care, including drip systems, was discussed. Personal experiences were shared about the consequences of planting the wrong trees without proper knowledge. The need for effective communication and education regarding tree planting was highlighted.

The franchise agreement for fiber was mentioned as being in progress.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting concluded with a motion to adjourn.